



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक

WEEKLY

सं. 18]

नई दिल्ली, जुलाई 9—जुलाई 15, 2017, शनिवार/आषाढ 18 — आषाढ 24, 1939

No. 18]

NEW DELHI, JULY 9— JULY 15, 2017, SATURDAY/ ASADHA 18— ASADHA 24, 1939

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (iii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (iii)

केन्द्रीय अधिकारियों (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए साधारण आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Orders and Notifications issued by the Central Authorities (Other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग सचिवालय

नई दिल्ली, 1 जून, 2017

आ.अ. 29.— लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13-क की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत निर्वाचन आयोग उत्तराखण्ड राज्य सरकार के परामर्श से एतद्वारा, श्रीमती राधा रतूरी, आई.ए.एस. के स्थान पर डॉ. उमाकांत पंवार, आई.ए.एस. (यू.के.डी. 1991) को उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से आगामी आदेशों तक के लिए उत्तराखण्ड राज्य के मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में नामित करता है।

2. डॉ. उमाकांत पंवार, उत्तराखण्ड सरकार के अधीन सभी पदभार या किसी कार्य के पदभारों को तत्काल सौंप देंगे या धारण करना समाप्त कर देंगे, जो कि वे ऐसा पदभार ग्रहण करने से पहले धारण कर रहे थे।

3. डॉ. उमाकांत पंवार, मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी, उत्तराखण्ड के रूप में कार्य करते हुए उत्तराखण्ड सरकार के अधीन किसी भी प्रकार का कोई अतिरिक्त कार्यभार ग्रहण नहीं करेंगे सिवाय इसके कि उनको राज्य सचिवालय में निर्वाचन विभाग के प्रभारी, सरकार के सचिव पदाभिहित किया जाएगा।

[सं. 154/यूकेडी/2017-पी.प्रशा.]

आदेश से,

स्टैण्डहोप युहलुंग, प्रधान सचिव

SECRETARIAT OF THE ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 1st June, 2017

O. N. 29.— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India in consultation with the Government of Uttarakhand hereby nominates Dr. Umakant Panwar, IAS, (UKD:1991) as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Uttarakhand with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders vice Smt. Radha Raturi, IAS.

2. Dr. Umakant Panwar shall cease to hold and hand over forthwith the charge of all or any charges of work under the Government of Uttarakhand, which he may be holding before such assumption of office.

3. Dr. Umakant Panwar while functioning as the Chief Electoral Officer, Uttarakhand shall not hold any additional charge whatsoever under the Government of Uttarakhand except that he should be designated Secretary to the Government in charge of Election Department in the State Secretariat.

[No. 154/UKD/2017-P. Admn.]

By Order,

STANDHOPE YUHLUNG, Principal Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2017

आ.अ. 30.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13-क की उप-धारा (1) एवं जम्मू व कश्मीर लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम 1957 की धारा 7-क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं आयोग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना दिनांक 30.06.2017 के अधिक्रमण में भारत निर्वाचन आयोग जम्मू व कश्मीर राज्य सरकार के परामर्श से एतद्वारा, श्री शांतमनु, आई.ए.एस. के स्थान पर श्री शालीन काबरा, आई.ए.एस. (जे.के. 1992) को उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से आगामी आदेशों तक के लिए जम्मू व कश्मीर राज्य के मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में नामित करता है।

2. श्री शालीन काबरा, जम्मू व कश्मीर सरकार के अधीन सभी पदभार या किसी कार्य के पदभारों को तत्काल सौंप देंगे या धारण करना समाप्त कर देंगे, जो कि वे ऐसा पदभार ग्रहण करने से पहले धारण कर रहे थे।

3. श्री शालीन काबरा, मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी, जम्मू व कश्मीर के रूप में कार्य करते हुए जम्मू व कश्मीर सरकार के अधीन किसी भी प्रकार का कोई अतिरिक्त कार्यभार ग्रहण नहीं करेंगे सिवाय इसके कि उनको राज्य सचिवालय में निर्वाचन विभाग के प्रभारी, सरकार के सचिव पदाभिहित किया जाएगा।

[सं. 154/जे एण्ड के/2017-पी. प्रशा.]

आदेश से,

स्टैण्डहोप युहलुंग, प्रधान सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2017

O.N. 30.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950) and Section 7A of the Jammu & Kashmir Representation of the People Act, 1957 and in supersession of the Commission's Notification of even number dated 30.06.2017, the Election Commission of India in consultation with the Government of Jammu & Kashmir hereby nominates Shri Shaleen Kabra, IAS, (JK:1992) as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Jammu & Kashmir with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders *vice* Shri Shantmanu, IAS.

2. Shri Shaleen Kabra shall cease to hold and hand over forthwith the charge of all or any charges of work under the Government of Jammu & Kashmir, which he may be holding before such assumption of office.

3. Shri Shaleen Kabra while functioning as the Chief Electoral Officer, Jammu & Kashmir shall not hold any additional charge whatsoever under the Government of Jammu & Kashmir except that he should be designated Secretary to the Government in charge of Election Department in the State Secretariat.

[No. 154/J&K/2017-P. Admn.]

By Order,

STANDHOPE YUHLUNG, Principal Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2017

आ.अ. 31.— लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13-क की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत निर्वाचन आयोग हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य सरकार के परामर्श से एतद्वारा, श्री नरिंदर चौहान, आई.ए.एस. के स्थान पर श्री पुष्पेन्द्र राजपूत, आई.ए.एस. (एच.पी. 1999) को उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से आगामी आदेशों तक के लिए हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य के मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में नामित करता है।

2. श्री पुष्पेन्द्र राजपूत, हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार के अधीन सभी पदभार या किसी कार्य के पदभारों को तत्काल सौंप देंगे या धारण करना समाप्त कर देंगे, जो कि वे ऐसा पदभार ग्रहण करने से पहले धारण कर रहे थे।

3. श्री पुष्पेन्द्र राजपूत, मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी, हिमाचल प्रदेश के रूप में कार्य करते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार के अधीन किसी भी प्रकार का कोई अतिरिक्त कार्यभार ग्रहण नहीं करेंगे सिवाय इसके कि उनको राज्य सचिवालय में निर्वाचन विभाग के प्रभारी, सरकार के सचिव पदाभिहित किया जाएगा।

[सं. 154/एचपी/2017-पी.प्रशा.]

आदेश से,

बी. सी. पात्रा, सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2017

O. N. 31.— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India in consultation with the Government of Himachal Pradesh hereby nominates Sh. Pushpendra Rajput, IAS, (HP:1999) as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Himachal Pradesh with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders vice Sh. Narinder Chauhan, IAS.

2. Sh. Pushpendra Rajput, IAS, cease to hold and hand over forthwith the charge of all or any charges of work under the Government of Himachal Pradesh, which he may be holding before such assumption of office.

3. Sh. Pushpendra Rajput, IAS while functioning as the Chief Electoral Officer, Himachal Pradesh shall not hold any additional charge whatsoever under the Government of Himachal Pradesh except that he should be designated Secretary to the Government in charge of Election Department in the State Secretariat.

[No. 154/HP/2017-P. Admn.]

By Order,

B. C. PATRA, Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2017

आ. अ. 32.— लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13-क की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत निर्वाचन आयोग दमन एवं दीव तथा दादरा एवं नगर हवेली संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के प्रशासन के परामर्श से एतद्वारा, श्री दीपक कुमार एस.बी., आई.ए.एस. (ए.जी.एम.यू.-2005) को, उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से, आगामी आदेशों तक के लिए दमन एवं दीव तथा दादरा एवं नगर हवेली संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में नामित करता है।

[सं. 154/डीडी एवं डीएनएच/2017-पी. प्रशा.]

आदेश से,

बी. सी. पात्रा, सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2017

O. N. 32.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Administrations of the Union Territories of Daman & Diu and Dadra & Nagar Haveli, hereby nominates Shri Deepak Kumar S.B., IAS (AGMU:2005) as the Chief Electoral Officer for the Union Territories of Daman & Diu and Dadra & Nagar Haveli, with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders.

[No. 154/DD&DNH/2017-P. Admn.]

By Order,

B. C. PATRA, Secy.

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2017

आ.अ. 33.— यतः निर्वाचन आयोग को समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा-विनिर्दिष्ट राजस्थान से लोक सभा के साधारण निर्वाचन, 2014 के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उसके सामने विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्दीन बनाए गए नियमों एवं आदेशों द्वारा अपेक्षित उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा-दर्शित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी विधि द्वारा अपेक्षित लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं; और

यतः, उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने निर्वाचन आयोग द्वारा सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है एवं विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग को यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायौचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब निर्वाचन आयोग, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में नीचे के सारणी के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों का संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य/संघ राज्य क्षेत्र की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है :-

सारणी

क्र. सं.	निर्वाचन का विवरण	निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्र. सं. और नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम व पता	निरर्हता का कारण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	राजस्थान लोकसभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन, 2014	09- भरतपुर (अ.जा.)	श्रीमती शीतल जाटव, अरविन्द कॉलोनी, कामां गेट, डीग तहसील, डीग जिला-भरतपुर, राजस्थान।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे
2.	—वही—	09- भरतपुर (अ.जा.)	श्री लाखन सिंह, ग्राम व पोस्ट — बरिघा, तहसील रुपवास, जिला — भरतपुर, राजस्थान।	—वही—

[सं. 76/राज.-लो. स./2014]

आदेश से,

प्रमोद कुमार शर्मा, सचिव

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA**ORDER**

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2017

O. N. 33.—Whereas, the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the General Election to the Lok Sabha in Rajasthan, 2014 as specified in Column (2) held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his/her name, has failed to lodge any account of his/her election expenses required by law as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and Rules and Orders made there under; and

Whereas, the said candidate(s) have not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice and the Election Commission is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of Section 10A of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State/Union Territory for a period of three years from the date of this order:—

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of Election	No. and Name of Constituency	Name and address of contesting candidate	Reasons for disqualification
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	General Election to the Lok Sabha, 2014 in the State of Rajasthan	09- Bharatpur (SC)	Smt. Sheetal Jatav, Arvind Colony, Kaman Gate, Deeg, Tehsil - Deeg, Distt.- Bharatpur, Rajasthan.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses.
2.	-do-	09- Bharatpur (SC)	Sh. Lakhan Singh Village & Post Barigha, Tehsil - Rupbas, Distt.- Bharatpur, Rajasthan.	-do-

[No. 76/RJ- HP/2014]

By Order,

PRAMOD KUMAR SHARMA, Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2017

आ. अ. 34.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग को समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा-विनिर्दिष्ट राजस्थान विधान सभा के साधारण निर्वाचन, 2013 के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उनके नाम के सामने विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों एवं आदेशों द्वारा अपेक्षित उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा-दर्शित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी विधि द्वारा अपेक्षित लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ; और

यतः, उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने निर्वाचन आयोग द्वारा सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है , एवं विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग को यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायौचित्य नहीं है :

अतः, अब निर्वाचन आयोग, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में नीचे के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों का संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य/संघ राज्य क्षेत्र की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए एतद्वारा निरर्हित घोषित करता है :—

सारणी

क्रम सं.	निर्वाचन का विवरण	निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्रम सं. एवं नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम तथा पता	निरर्हता का कारण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	राजस्थान विधान सभा के साधारण निर्वाचन, 2013	30-उदयपुरवाटी	श्री नरेंद्र सैनी, वार्ड नं. 2, मालियो की ढाणी, चिड़ावा, जिला - झुंझुनू राजस्थान।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल
2.	-वही-	51-सिविल लाईन्स	श्री गोपाल कृष्ण, 28, सुशीलपुरा, सरकारी स्कूल के पास, सोडाला, जयपुर राजस्थान।	-वही-
3.	-वही-	194-किशनगंज (अ.ज.जा.)	श्री हरदयाल, ग्राम व पोस्ट - ढोटी, तहसील- अटरू, जिला - बारां राजस्थान ।	-वही-

[सं. 76/राज.-वि.स./2013]

आदेश से,

प्रमोद कुमार शर्मा, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2017

O. N. 34.—Whereas, the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the General Election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly, 2013 as specified in Column (2) held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses required by law as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and Rules and Orders made there under; and

Whereas, the said candidate(s) have not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice and the Election Commission is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of Section 10A of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State/Union Territory for a period of three years from the date of this order: —

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of Election	Sl.No. and Name of the Assembly Constituency	Name and Address of the Contesting Candidate	Reason for disqualification
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	General Election to the Legislative Assembly, 2013 in the State of Rajasthan	30-Udaipurwati	Sh. Narendra Saini, Ward No. 2, Maliyo Ki Dhani, Chidawa, Distt.- Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses
2.	-do-	51- Civil Lines	Sh. Gopal Krishan 28, Sushilpura, Sarkari School Ke Pass, Sodala, Jaipur, Rajasthan.	-do-
3.	-do-	194- Kishanganj (ST)	Sh. Hardayal Village & Post Dhoti, Tehsil- Ataroo, Distt.- Baran, Rajasthan.	-do-

[No. 76/RJ-LA/2013]

By Order,

PRAMOD KUMAR SHARMA, Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2017

आ.अ. 35.—जबकि, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य की लोक सभा के साधारण निर्वाचन, 2014 के लिए, जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उसके सामने विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा दीर्घा अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं; और

जबकि, उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए या तो कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है या उनके द्वारा दिए गए अभ्यावेदनों पर, यदि कोई हो, विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायौचित्य नहीं है;

अतः, अब, निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10—क के अनुसरण में नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य/संघ राज्य क्षेत्र की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और सदस्य होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है:—

सारणी

क्रम सं.	निर्वाचन क्षेत्र का विवरण	निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्रम संख्या और नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम व पता	निरर्हता का कारण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य से लोक सभा के लिए सामान्य निर्वाचन, 2014	37—अमेठी	रवी कुमार, ग्राम व पोस्ट सरवन (फुरसतगंज), जनपद अमेठी ।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे ।
2.	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य से लोक सभा के लिए सामान्य निर्वाचन, 2014	37—अमेठी	वेदपाल शास्त्री, आर्य समाज मंदिर झिलमिल कालोनी, शहादरा, दिल्ली-110095	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे ।
3.	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य से लोक सभा के लिए सामान्य निर्वाचन, 2014	37—अमेठी	उमाकांत, मोहल्ला मार्कसीद नारनौल, तहसील नारनौल, जनपद महेन्द्रगढ़ (हरियाणा) ।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे ।
4.	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य से लोक सभा के लिए सामान्य निर्वाचन, 2014	37—अमेठी	जितेन्द्र सिंह, ग्राम— बारधर्म, पोस्ट बारकोट, तहसील तिलोई, जनपद अमेठी ।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे ।
5.	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य से लोक सभा के लिए सामान्य निर्वाचन, 2014	37—अमेठी	द्वारिका प्रसाद, ग्राम पूरे ओझा मजरे नूरुद्दीनपुर, पोस्ट करहियाबाजार, जनपद रायबरेली ।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे ।
6.	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य से लोक सभा के लिए सामान्य निर्वाचन, 2014	37—अमेठी	मिथिलेश कुमारी, ग्राम घुरहा, पोस्ट टिकरी, जनपद अमेठी ।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे ।

[स. 76/उ.प्र.—लो.स./2014]

आदेश से,

अनुज जयपुरियार, प्रधान सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2017

O. N. 35.— Whereas, the Election Commission of India is satisfied that each of the contesting candidate specified in column (4) of the table below at the General Election to the Lok Sabha, 2014 from the State of Uttar Pradesh as specified in column (2) held from the Constituency specified in column (3) against his/her name has failed to lodge the account of his/her election expenses as shown in column (5) of the said table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the rules made thereunder;

And, whereas, the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notices of the Election Commission or after considering the representation made by them, if any, the Election Commission is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the table below to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State/ Union Territory for a period of three years from the date of this order: —

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particular of Election	Sl.No. & Name of Constituency	Name & Address of Contesting Candidates	Reason of Disqualification
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	General Election to the House of the People, State of Uttar Pradesh, 2014.	37-Amethi	Ravi Kumar, Village & Post- Sarvan (Fursatganj), District- Amethi.	Failed to lodge account of his/her election expenses.
2.	General Election to the House of the People, State of Uttar Pradesh, 2014.	37-Amethi	Vedpal Shastri, Aray Samaj Mandir Jhilmil Colony, Shahadra, Delhi-110095	Failed to lodge account of his/her election expenses.
3.	General Election to the House of the People, State of Uttar Pradesh, 2014.	37-Amethi	Uma Kant, Mohalla- Markseed, Narnaul, Tehsil- Narnaul, District Mahendragarh (Haryana).	Failed to lodge account of his/her election expenses.
4.	General Election to the House of the People, State of Uttar Pradesh, 2014.	37-Amethi	Jitendra Singh, Village- Bardharme, Post- Barkot, Tehsil- Tiloi, District- Amethi.	Failed to lodge account of his/her election expenses.
5.	General Election to the House of the People, State of Uttar Pradesh, 2014.	37-Amethi	Dwarika Prasad, Village- Pure Ojha Majre Nuruddinpur, Post- Karahia Bazar, District Raebarely.	Failed to lodge account of his/her election expenses.
6.	General Election to the House of the People, State of Uttar Pradesh, 2014.	37-Amethi	Mithilesh Kumari, Village- Ghuraha, Post- Tikari, District- Amethi.	Failed to lodge account of his/her election expenses.

[No. 76/UP-HP/2014]

By Order,

ANUJ JAIPURIAR, Principal Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 13 जुलाई, 2017

आ.अ. 36.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951(1951 का 43) की धारा 106(क) के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग 2014 की निर्वाचन याचिका सं. 27 में आंध्र प्रदेश एवं तेलंगाना उच्च न्यायालय के आदेश दिनांक 15.02.2017 को एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता है।

(निर्णय अधिसूचना के अंग्रेजी भाग में छपा है)

[सं. 82/ईसीआई/प्रादेशिक/तेलंगाना-लो.स. (27)/2014/2017]

आदेश से,

एस.के. रुडोला, प्रधान सचिव

New Delhi, the 13th July, 2017

O. N. 36.—In pursuance of section 106 (a) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana dated 15-02-2017 in Election Petition No. 27 of 2014.

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH**

WEDNESDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND SEVENTEEN

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SURESH KUMAR KAIT

ELECTION PETITION No: 27 of 2014

Between:

M.A. Basith, S/o M.A. Lateef, Age about 60 years, Occ: Public service, R/o H. No. 20-2-930/1, Doodh Bowli, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. Asaduddin Owaisi, S/o, Late Sultan Salahuddin Owaisi, Aged 43 years, Occ: Politician, #3-6-149, Hyderguda, Hyderabad-500029
2. The Returning Officer, 09-Hyderabad Parliamentary Constituency, O/o. The District Collector, Hyderabad Dist. Hyderabad.
3. District Election Officer, O/o The Commissioner, GHMC, CC Complex, Tank Bund Road, Lower Tank Bund, Hyderabad-500029.
4. Chief Electoral Officer of A.P., Secretariat Complex, Hyderabad.
5. The Election Commission of India, Nravan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110001.

(RR 4 & 5 are deleted from the array of the Respondents as per Court Order dated 07/02/2017 vide Appl. No.85/15.)

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Section 81 r/w Sec. 100 (1) (d) (iv) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 praying that in the circumstances stated in the petition/affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to

- a) Call for record related to the elections to the 09 –Hyderabad Parliamentary Constituency held on 30-4-2014 and declare the election of the 1st respondent (Mr. Asaduddin Owaisi) to the 09-Hyderabad Parliamentary Constituency to be null and void; and set aside the same
- b) Call for duty log of the Central Paramilitary Forces (CPF) personnel posted at each polling booth of 09-Hyderabad Parliamentary Constituency on 30-4-2014
- c) Call from the election commissioner the registers (Form 17-A) in which signature of all voters are available for judicial scrutiny.

- d) Call for records from MRO, Rajendranagar Mandal, in respect of 4 acres of land acquired by the 1st respondent in Survey No. 15 of Mailardevpally village in Rajendranagar Mandal, R.R. District for judicial scrutiny
- e) Direct the 5th Respondent to furnish before this Hon'ble court for judicial scrutiny a printed report of – the result of poll, event log data, hourly total data, voter map data and voter time stamp data – which can be taken from all the EVMs used in the election for 09-Hyderabad Parliamentary Constituency.
- f) Call for records for judicial scrutiny from R.D.O & S.D.M Chevella Division in respect of Conversion of land from Agriculture to Non- agriculture in connection with the land acquired by the 1st respondent in Sy. No. 15, Mailardevpally village, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy district.
- g) Call for records for District Collector Ranga Reddy in respect of land use Certification in respect of conversion from Agriculture to Non-Agriculture for Commercial/Residential purpose in connection with the land owned by the 1st respondent in Sy. No. 15, Mailardevpally village, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy district.
- h) award the cost of the Petition
- i) and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

The petition coming on for hearing upon perusing the petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Sri V. Venkata Mayur, Advocate, for the petitioner and of Sri. S. Niranjan Reddy, Advocate, for the Respondent No. 1 and of GP for General Administration (TS), for the Respondent Nos. 2 & 3.

The Court made the following Order:-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SURESH KUMAR KAIT

ELECTION PETITION No. 27 OF 2014

ORDER:

Sri V. Venkat Mayur, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has informed this Court that the petitioner in the present petition has expired recently.

Accordingly, this Election Petition is dismissed as abated as per Section 112 (1) of Representation of the Peoples Act, 1951 (for short "the Act").

Consequently, the Registrar (Judicial) is directed to publish the same under Section 112 (2) of the Act.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Sd/-

V. RAMESH

Jt. REGISTRAR

HIGH COURT

DATED : 15.02.2017

ORDER

EP. No. 27 of 2014

DISMISSING THE EP AS ABATED

WITHOUT COSTS.

[No. 82/ECI/TERR/TEL-HP (27/2014)/2017]

By Order,

S. K. RUDOLA, Principal Secy.

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 2017

आ.अ. 37.—निर्वाचन अर्जी संख्या 02/2014 में झारखंड उच्च न्यायालय के तारीख 22 सितम्बर, 2015 के निर्णय के विरुद्ध दाखिल की गई 2015 की सिविल अपील संख्या 14007 में भारत के उच्चतम न्यायालय के दिनांक 11 दिसम्बर, 2015 के निर्णय को लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 116 ग (2) (ख) के अनुसरण में, निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता है।

(आदेश अधिसूचना के अंग्रेजी भाग में छपा है)

[सं. 82/ईपी/(02/2014)/टीईआरआर/ईएस-आई/जेएच-एचपी/2017]

आदेश से,

केदार नाथ भार, सचिव

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 2017

O. N. 37.—In pursuance of clause (b) sub Section (2) of Section 116C of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order dated 11th December, 2015 of the Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 14007 of 2015 filed against the Judgement, dated 22.9.2015 of the High Court of Jharkhand at Ranchi in Election Petition No. 02 of 2014.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****CIVIL APPEAL NO. 14007 of 2015**

DR. SURAJ MANDAL

...Appellant (s)

VERSUS

DR. RAVINDRA KUMAR ROY AND ANR.

...Respondent (s)

ORDER

We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and perused the record. We do not see any cogent reason to entertain the appeal. The judgment impugned does not warrant any interference.

The Civil Appeal is dismissed.

.....J.

[J. CHELAMESWAR]

.....J.

[ABHAY MANOHAR SAPRE]

New Delhi

Dated : December 11, 2015

ITEM No. 13

COURT No. 5

SECTION XVII

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Civil Appeal No (s). 14007/2015

DR. SURAJ MANDAL

...Appellant (s)

VERSUS

DR. RAVINDRA KUMAR ROY AND ANR.

...Respondent (s)

(with appln. (s) for exemption from filing O.T.)

Date : 11.12.2015 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J. CHELAMESWAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ABHAY MANOHAR SAPRE

For Appellant(s) Mr. Mohak Badana, Adv.

Mr. P. N. Puri, Adv.

Mrs. Reta Dewan Puri, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

ORDER

Application for exemption from filing O.T. is allowed.

The appeal is dismissed, in terms of the signed order.

[O. P. SHARMA]

[INDU BALA KAPUR]

AR-cum-PS

COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)

[No. 82/EP/(02/2014)/TERR/ES-I/JH-HP/2017]

By Order,

KEDAR NATH BHAR, Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 2017

आ.अ. 38.— लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951(1951 का 43) की धारा 106(क) के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग 2016 की निर्वाचन याचिका सं. 1 में आंध्र प्रदेश एवं तेलंगाना उच्च न्यायालय के आदेश दिनांक 19.09.2016 को एतद्द्वारा प्रकाशित करता है।

(निर्णय अधिसूचना के अंग्रेजी भाग में छपा है)

[सं. 82/ईसीआई/प्रादेशिक/तेलंगाना-लो.सं. (1/2016)/2017]

आदेश से,

एस. के. रुडोला, प्रधान सचिव

New Delhi, the 28th June, 2017

O. N. 38.— In pursuance of section 106 (a) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana dated 19-09-2016 in Election Petition No. 1 of 2016.

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH**

MONDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND SIXTEEN

**PRESENT
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K. JAISWAL**

ELECTION APPLICATION NO. 623 OF 2016

IN

ELECTION PETITION NO. 1 OF 2016

Between:

Mr. Dayakar Pasunoori, S/o, Prakasham,
Aged about 48 years,
R/o. H. No. 3-129, Bollikunta village & Post,
Sangem Mandal, Warangal District.

... Petitioner/1st Respondent

AND

1. Survey sathyanarayana, S/o. Late Laxmaiah,
Aged about 61 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o. Plot No. 43, Road No. 4,
Thrimoorthy Colony, Mahendra Hills,
East Marredopally, Secunderabad – 500 026
2. Mr. Devaiah Pagidipati, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 1-118/A/B/409,
Plot No. 409, BETA, Jayabheri Silicon County,
Madapur, Hyderabad – 500 082.
3. Mr. Nalla Surya Prakash, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 42-748/V/25, Moulali,
Malkajigiri Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.
4. Mr. Kanakam Devadas, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o H. No. 9-220, Mulugu Village and Mandal,
Warangal District.
5. Mr. Jajula Bhaskar, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 1-6-48, Old Alwal, Bollaram Post,
Secunderabad – 500 010.
6. Mr. Jeedi Sadanandam, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 1-148/1, Kanagarthi Village,\
Jammikunta Mandal, Karimnagar District.
7. Mr. Pasula Rammurthy, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 1-128/A, Narlapur Village,
S.S. Thadvai Mandal, Warangal District.
8. Mr. Palvai Venu, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 4-12-10/2, High Court Colony,
Road No. 4, Vanasthalipuram, Hayathnagar,
Ranga Reddy District.
9. Mr. Bandi Kranthi Kumar, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner,
Aged Major, R/o. Baironipalli, Siddapur Post, Hasanparthy
Mandal, Warangal District.

... Respondent/Petitioner

10. Velthuru Mallaiah, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 21-2-195/9/1, Larthu Nagar, F.C.I. Road, Shanthi Naagar, Ramagundam, Karimnagar District.
11. Mr. Gabbeta Babu, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 3-88, Mylaram Village, Rayaparathi Mandal, Warangal District.
12. Prof. Gali Vinod Kumar, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 12-13-132/1, Flat No. 202, Kibriya Residency, Street No. 3, Tarnaka, Secunderabad – 500m 017.
13. Mr. Guggilla Sagar, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 5-41/2, Ambedkar Colony, Mulugu Village and Mandal, Warangal District.
14. Mr. Gangaram Saibaba, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 11-9-115/2/2, Plot No. B4, Road No. 2, Laxminagar Colony, Kothapet, Saroornagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.
15. Mr. Jannu Mahendar, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 14-6-296, Nizampura, Mandi Bazar, Warangal, Warangal District.
16. Mr. Pendela Devaraju, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 2-57, Bagirthipeta Village, Regonda Mandal, Warangal District.
17. Mr. Barla Srinivas, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 3-88, Madikonda Village, Hanamakonda Mandal, Warangal District.
18. Smt. Banda Susheela, W/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 1-17, Burahanpaliy Village, Rayaparathi Mandal, Warangal District – 506 314.
19. Mr. Yeachu Sunil, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 8-3-51, Nizampet, Khammam District.
20. Mr. Ripeeka Prem Kumar, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. 8-3-51, Nizampet, Khammam District.
21. Mr. Vemula Ramesh, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. 3-6, Duddenapally Village, Saidapur Mandal, Karimnagar District.
22. Mr. Sandra Johnson, S/o. Not known to the Petitioner, Aged Major, R/o. H. No. 16-8-200, Abbanikunta, Warangal, Warangal District – 506 013.
23. The Election Commission of India, rep. by its Secretary, Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi – 110 001.
24. The Returning Officer-cum-District Collector, Warangal District, State of Telangana.

25. The Chief Electoral Officer,
Andhra Pradesh and Telangana,
South, H. Block, Secretariat, Hyderabad – 500 022.

26. Union of India,
Represented by its Secretary,
Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, New Delhi.

... Respondents/Respondents 2 to 26

(Respondents 2 to 26 are not necessary)

Election Application under Order VII Rule II of C.P.C. Praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court will be pleased to reject the Election Petition in E.P. No. 1 of 2016 under Order VII Rule II of Civil Procedure Code, 1908.

The Application coming on for hearing upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Sri P. Kesava Rao, Advocate for the Petitioner and of Sri T. Lakshmi Narayana, Advocate for the Respondent.

The Court made the following Order:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. S. K. JAISWAL

APPLICATION No. 623 of 2016

IN

ELECTION PETITION No. 1 of 2016

ORDERS:

The present application is filed by the petitioner/1st respondent-Dayakar Pasunoori under Order VII Rule – 11 of Code of Civil Procedure to reject the Election Petition No. 1 of 2016 filed by the respondent/petitioner-Survey Sathanarayana.

2. For the sake of Convenience, the parties are referred to as arrayed in the main Election Petition No. 1 of 2016.

3. The main Election Petition No. 1 of 2016 is filed seeking to declare to election of the 1st respondent-Dayakar Pasunoori as Member of Parliament for 15-Warangal (SC) Parliamentary Constituency as void and in turn to declare the petitioner-Survey Sathanarayana as duly elected person.

4. The present application is filed on the ground that petitioner has failed to comply with the provisions of Section 123 of the Representation of Peoples Act, 1951 (for short "the Act"). Under Section 83 (1)(a) of the Act, it is obligatory on the part of the petitioner to file an election petition with all material facts. The 1st respondent did not mention in Form No.26 about the contract entered into by himself and his wife with Bharath petroleum Corporation Limited. The Petitioner failed to give material particulars to satisfy the ingredients of Section 9-A and 123 of the Act with supporting evidence. As per Section 83 (1)(c) of the Act, every election petition shall be signed by the petitioner and verified in the manner laid down in the Code of Civil Procedure and it is Mandatory to sign in the presence of Notary, but the petitioner has not done so. It is settled law that election petitions can be rejected at the threshold for non-compliance of the mandatory provisions as contemplated under the Act. There is no cause of action to file the election petition.

5. The basic ingredient of Section 9-A of the Act is that there should be a subsisting contract entered into with the appropriate Government for the supply of goods to, or for execution of any works undertaken by that Government. The appropriate Government is the State Government or the Central Government, but not the local or other authorities under the control of the State Government/Central Government. Since the Bharath Petroleum Corporation Limited cannot be equated with the appropriate Government as per Section 9-A of the Act, the ground on which the election petition is filed is untenable and the election petition is liable to be dismissed. The petitioner cannot club the Election Press Note and the declaration of result in form No. 21-D together, since both are independent of each other. Form No. 21-D is not filed along with the verification. Each annexure does not have verification separately. The documents referred to in Annexure-VIII are independent newspaper clippings and they would have been filed independently with separate verifications. The petitioner failed to file separate affidavits in compliance with the provisions as well as the Rules framed with regard to proving the corrupt practice. The election petition suffers from lack of material facts and hence the same is liable to be rejected.

6. The petitioner filed counter denying the contentions of the 1st respondent. It is submitted that the present application filed by the 1st respondent under Order 7 Rule -11 CPC do not fall within the ambit of Order 7 Rule -11(a), (b), (c) & (d) of CPC. Whether the election petition discloses a cause of action or not, the Court has to look into the allegations in the election petition. There is no contention raised by the 1st respondent that the relief claimed is undervalued and the petitioner is required to correct the valuation within a time fixed by the court. In the absence of any such contention or pleading, within the ambit or order 7 Rule-11(b) CPC, the present application is liable to be dismissed.

7. The non-filing of verification in respect of Election Press Note and the declaration of result in Form-21D are curable defects. The present application is not filed by the counsel for the 1st respondent Mr. M. Ajay Kumar, who was on record as on 07.07.2016, but it was filed by Mr. P. Keshava Rao and D. Narsimulu, who are not the counsel on record for the respondent, and therefore, the application is liable to be dismissed.

8. The Election Petition was filed on 04.01.2016, registered on 18.01.2016, summons for settlement of issues was served on the respondent on 08.04.2016 and the respondent entered appearance through his counsel Mr. M. Ajay Kumar on 21.04.2016. The 30 days time prescribed under Order 8 Rule-1 CPC for filing written statement/counter to the Election petition expired on 08.05.2016. The 90 day time under proviso to Order 8 Rule-1 CPC also expired by 07.07.2016. The time extended by this Court for the respondent to file his written statement/counter expired on 08.07.2016. The respondent failed to file written statement/counter within 90 days. The filing of piecemeal applications, raising objections, be it preliminary or otherwise, including the present application, would lead to undesirable result and the application is liable to be dismissed.

9. The averments of the present application are very vague and do not specify which part of the election petition do not comply with the provisions of the Act. The averments in the election petition alone have to be looked into and should presume to be correct for the time being so as to find out whether such averments disclose a cause of action or not, but not any other material. Material fact means a subject-matter of the statement related to a fact or circumstance which would be important, significant or essential for making a reasonable decision and hence the averments made in the election petition contain full material facts making out prima facie case. The election Petition and other affidavits are sworn, affirmed and signed in the presence of the notary. The petitioner has complied with the procedure as contemplated under the mandatory provisions of the Act. The petitioner denied all the contentions as raised by the 1st respondent in the present application. It is stated that the election petition contain full material facts and there is cause of action to file the election petition and thus it is maintainable, and therefore, the present application is liable to be dismissed.

10. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent.

11. The points that arise for consideration are as to:-

1) Whether the Election Petition, in the instant case, contains material facts so as to proceed with the trial?; Or

2) Whether the petitioner/R.1 has suffered disqualification falling within the ambit of Section 9-A of the Act?;

or

3) Whether the averments made in the Election Petitioner do not disclose any cause of action so as to reject the same at the threshold under the provisions of Order VII Rule 11 of C.P.C.?

Points:

12. The petitioner/R.1 was declared elected as a Member of Parliament for the Warangal (SC) parliamentary constituency in the election held on 21.11.2015. The first respondent herein was the unsuccessful candidate. He filed the Election Petition alleging that the petitioner/R.1 has suffered the disqualification in view of his existing contract along with his wife with Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, which is a disqualification as per Section 9-A of the Act and that the petitioner/R.1 has indulged in corrupt practices as envisaged under Section 123 of the Act. The first respondent in the Election Petition has filed the application in hand for rejecting the Election petition at the threshold under the provisions of Order VII Rule 11 C.P.C., on the ground that there is no cause of action for the Election Petitioner and that the material facts as required under Section 83 of the Act have not been set forth. Even though it was not specifically mentioned in the application that the Election Petition is sought to be rejected for want of cause of action as contemplated under sub-clause (a) of Rule 11 of Order VII C.P.C., but the contents thereof make it clear that the petitioner is seeking the rejection of the Election petition on that ground.

13. It is well-settled that for deciding an application under Order VII Rule 11 C.P.C., the averments in the petition are relevant and suffice it if material facts are averred in a petition though it may not incumbent for the petitioner to set out the material particulars, In this connection, it may be appropriate to refer to the authority of the Supreme Court reported in **MAHADEORAO SUKAJI SHIVANKAR v. RAMARATAN BAPU AND ORS**¹,

¹ (2004) 7 SCC 181

Wherein it is observed at para 6 as under:-

“Now, it is no doubt true that all material facts have to be set out in an election petition. If material facts are not stated in a plaint or a petition, the same is liable to be dismissed on that ground alone as the case would be covered by Clause (a) of Rule 11 of Order VII of the Code. The question, however, is as to whether the petitioner had set out material facts in the election petition. The expression “material facts” has neither been defined in the Act nor in the Code. It may be stated that the material facts are those facts upon which a party relies for his claim or defence. In other words, material facts are facts upon which the plaintiff’s cause of action or defendant’s defence depends. What particulars could be said to be material facts would depend upon the facts of each case and no rule of universal application can be laid down. It is, however, absolutely essential that all basic and primary facts which must be proved at the trial by the party to establish existence of cause of action or defence are material facts and must be stated in the pleading of the party.”

14. Other decision on this aspect is the one reported in **MAHENDRA PAL V. RAM DASS MALANGER & ORS.**². The Hon’ble Supreme Court at paragraphs-7 & 24 held as under:

“7. Section 83(1)(a) of the Act mandates that in order to constitute a cause of action, all material facts, that is, the basic and preliminary facts which the petitioner is bound under the law to substantiate in order to succeed, have to be pleaded in an election petition. Whether in an election petition, a particular fact is material or not and as such required to be pleaded is a question which depends upon the nature of the charge leveled and the facts and circumstances of each case. The distinction between ‘material facts’ and ‘particulars’ has been explained by this Court in a large number of cases and we need not refer to all those decided cases. Facts which are essential to disclose a complete cause of action are material facts and are essentially required to be pleaded. On the other hand “particulars” are details of the case set up by the party and are such pleas which are necessary to amplify, refine or explain material facts. The function of particulars is, thus, to present a full picture of the cause of action to make the opposite party understand the case that has been set up against him and which he is required to meet. The distinction between ‘material facts’ and ‘material particulars’ is indeed important because different consequences follow from a deficiency of such facts or particulars in the pleadings. Failure to plead even a single material fact leads to an incomplete cause of action and incomplete allegations of such a charge are liable to be struck off under Order 6, Rule 16, CPC. In the case of a petition suffering from deficiency of material particulars the Court has the discretion to allow the petitioner to supply the required particulars even after the expiry of limitation. Thus, whereas it may be permissible for a party to furnish particulars even after the period of limitation for filing an election petition has expired, with permission of the Court, no material fact unless already pleaded, can be permitted to be introduced, after the expiry of the period of limitation.

24. Our perusal of various paragraphs of the election petition and particularly of the averments contained in paragraphs 10 to 13, 16 and 20, go to show that sufficient material facts, to provide a cause of action, for trial of the election petition have been provided in the election petition. In various sub-paras of paragraph 11 of the election petition particulars of irregularities have also been spelt out. The non-mention of serial numbers of the improperly counted ballot papers, keeping in view the averments made in paragraph 16 of the petition, could not be a ground to non-suit the election petitioner at the threshold, without trial more particularly because of the discrepancy between Ex.P.2 and Ex.P.3. Pleadings have to be read as a whole to ascertain their true import. It is the substance and not merely the form, which is required to be looked into for construing the pleadings. The intention of the party needs to be gathered from the tenor and terms of his pleadings taken as a whole. These well settled principles appear to have been lost sight of by the learned designated judge. Construed reasonable, the averments in the election petition, in our opinion, do make out a case for the petition proceeding to trial. Whether or not a case is eventually made out to justify recount/inspection would depend upon the evidence led by the parties in support of their pleadings at the trial.”

15. Adverting to the facts of the case in hand, as already stated, the main stay of the petitioner’s case is that the contents of the Election petition are vague and they do not contain the material particulars as required and that the first respondent/Election Petitioner has no cause of action.

16. As noticed above, the election of the petitioner is challenged on the ground that he suffered disqualification under Section 9-A of the Act and also indulged in corrupt practices as contemplated under Section 123 of the Act. During the course of hearing, learned senior Counsel appearing for the first respondent/Election Petitioner fairly submits that the Election Petition does not satisfy the requirements of the Act, inasmuch as, it does not contain the details as are required for questioning the election of the successful candidate on the grounds of corrupt practices. It is conceded that the petition does not contain material facts insofar as this ground is concerned. Therefore, this aspect need not detain as long.

17. The contention of the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner/successful candidate is that even if the allegation in the Election Petition is taken on its face value, it does not attract the provisions of Section 9-A of the Act since the successful candidate along with his wife are undoubtedly carrying on distributorship of a Government owned oil company dealing in the liquefied petroleum gas.

² AIR 2000 SC 16

18. The fact not in controversy is that the petitioner/R.1 along with his wife are having subsisting distributorship with the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., with the dealer code No. 142270 of village Wardhannapet, Warangal District. Whether this act of the successful candidate having a Distributorship in the Government owned Oil Company Constitutes disqualification so as to hold that the successful candidate is not competent to contest in an election to the Parliament, is in question.

19. Section 9-A of the Act reads as under:-

“Disqualification for Government contracts, etc.,—A person shall be disqualified if, and for so long as, there subsists a contract entered into by him in the course of his trade or business with the appropriate Government for the supply of goods to, or for the execution of any works undertaken by, that Government.

Explanation.—For the purposes of this Section, where a contract has been fully performed by the person by whom it has been entered into with the appropriate Government, the contract shall be deemed not to subsist by reason only of the fact that the Government has not performed its part of the contract either wholly or in part.”

20. As per Section 2 (e) of the Liquefied Petroleum Gas (Regulation of Supply and Distribution) Order, 2000 (for short ‘the Order’) a distributor has been defined as a person appointed by a Government oil company and engaged in the business of purchase, sale or storage for sale of liquefied petroleum gas in cylinders to consumers on the basis of an agreement with a Government oil company.

21. What is the Government Oil Company has been defined in sub-clause (g) of Section 2 of the above Order and it includes Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, which is relevant in the instant case.

22. Sub-clause (I) of Section 2 of the above Order defines the public distribution system as a system of distribution, marketing or selling of liquefied petroleum gas by Government oil company at the Government controlled or declared prices through a distribution system approved by the Central or State Government. Section 9 of the above Order puts restrictions and controls the business activities of a distributor in the following words:-

“Procurement, storage and sale of liquefied petroleum gas by a distributor.—(a) No distributor having stock of liquefied petroleum gas at the business premises, including storage point, shall, unless otherwise directed by a Government oil company or a parallel marketer, refuse to sell L.P.G. on any working day during working hours, to the consumer registered with that distributor.

(b) No distributor shall keep his business premises including the storage point closed during working hours on any working day without the prior written permission of the Government oil company or the parallel marketer.

Explanation.—For the purposes of sub-clause (a) and (b), the expression “working hours” means the working hours fixed by the concerned Government oil company or the parallel marketer in accordance with the provisions of the Shops and Establishments Act and the rules made thereunder, as in force in the respective States or the Union Territories, as the case may be.

(c) Every distributor shall take step to ensure that stocks of liquefied petroleum gas are available at the business premises, including the storage point, at all times.

(d) No distributor shall sell liquefied petroleum gas at a higher price than that fixed by the Government oil company or the parallel marketer.

(e) No distributor shall, without prior written permission of the concerned Government oil company, refuse to make home delivery at the address of the consumer, as registered with the distributor:

Provided that the State Government may, fix additional charges for home delivery of L.P.G. cylinders to the consumers, as it may deem necessary in view of the geographical terrain and/or the distance in the area of distribution.

(f) Every distributor shall display the working hours prominently at the place of business including the place of storage on a conspicuous place.”

23. Section 13 of the above Order confers power on any Officer of the Central or State Government in the following words:-

“Power of entry, search and seizure.—(1) Any Officer of the Central or the State Government not below the rank of Inspector duly authorised by a general or a special order, by the Central Government or the State Government, as the case may be or any Officer of a Government oil company not below the rank of Sales Officer, authorised by the Central Government, may, with a view to securing due compliance of this Order or any other order made thereunder:-

(a) stop and search any vessel or vehicle used or capable of being used for the transport or storage of any petroleum product,

(b) enter and search any place,

- (c) seize stocks of liquefied petroleum gas along with container and/or equipments, such as cylinders, gas cylinder valves, pressure regulators and seals in respect of which he has reason to believe that a contravention of this Order has been, or is being, or is about to be made.

(2) The sales Officer of a Government Oil Company shall be authorised to secure compliance of this Order by the distributors appointed under the Public distribution system and or by the consumer registered by them.”

24. Learned Counsel appearing for the Election Petitioner submits that if the provisions of the above Order are read along with Section 9-A of the Act it is clear that the petitioner/successful candidate is disqualified from contesting an election since admittedly there subsisted a contract entered into by him in the course of his trade or business with the Government for the supply of goods.

25. During the elaborate arguments, both the learned Counsel appearing for the Election Petitioner as well the Successful Candidate submitted various authorities in support of their respective contentions, which are briefly referred to hereunder:-

26. In **RAVINDER SINGH V. JANMEJA SINGH & ORS.**³ the Hon’ble Supreme Court at paragraph-11 held as under:

“11. Section 83 of the Act is mandatory in character and requires not only a concise statement of material facts and full particulars of the alleged corrupt practice, so as to present a full and complete picture of the action to be detailed in the election petition but under the proviso to Section 83(1) of the Act, the election petition leveling a charge of corrupt practice is required, by law, to be supported by an affidavit in which the election petitioner is obliged to disclose his source of information in respect of the commission of that corrupt practice. The reason for this insistence is obvious. It is necessary for an election petitioner to make such a charge with full responsibility and to prevent any finishing and roving enquiry and save the returned candidate from being taken by surprise. In the absence of proper affidavit, in the prescribed form, filed in support of the corrupt practice of bribery, the allegation pertaining thereto, could not be put to trial the defect being of a fatal nature.”

27. In **KARTAR SINGH BHADANA V. HARI SINGH NALWA**⁴ the Hon’bel Supreme Court at paragraphs-8,12 & 13 held as under:

“8. Insofar as is relevant to a case where it is alleged that a candidate holds a contract for the execution of works undertaken by an appropriate Government, Section 9A requires (a) that there should be a contract entered into by the candidate; (b) that it should be entered into by him in the course of his trade or business; (c) that it should be entered into with the appropriate Government; (d) that it should subsist; (e) that it should relate to works undertaken by that Government and (f) that it should be for the execution of such works. The provisions of Section 9A disqualify a citizen from contesting an election; a citizen may, therefore, be disqualified only if the facts of his case squarely fall within the conditions prescribed by Section 9A.

12. Reference was made to the mining leases by learned counsel for the first respondent. Thereunder, the appropriate Government has granted and demised to a partnership firm of which the appellant is a partner the right to win mineral from the areas therein mentioned. Clause 23 thereof, which was relied upon, says that if the lessee does not carry out its obligations under the covenants in the lease the lessor may cause the same to be carried out and performed and the lessee shall pay the lessor all expenses in this behalf. There is nothing in this clause in the leases which can support the submission made on behalf of the first respondent that the appellant had entered into a contract for the execution of any works undertaken by the Government.

13. As we see it, it is only when the appropriate Government has undertaken works, such as the laying of a road, the erection of a building or the construction of a dam, and has entered into a contract for the execution of such works that the contractor is disqualified under Section 9A. Section 9A does not operate to disqualify the lessee of a mining lease such as the appellant.”

28. In **DEWAN JOYNAL ABEDIN V. ABDUL WAZED**⁵ the Hon’bel Supreme Court at paragraphs -16, 17, 18, 19 & 20 held as under:

“16. An analysis of Section 9-A of the Act shows that only in two cases a person would be disqualified if he has entered into a contract with the appropriate Government in the course of his trade or business which is subsisting on the date of scrutiny of nomination. They are (i) when the contract is none for supply of goods to the appropriate Government and (ii) where the contract is for the execution of any works undertaken by that Government. If a contract belonging to either of the two categories is subsisting on the date of the nomination, the person will be disqualified for being chosen as a member. In the present case the contract is not one for supply of goods to the Government. It does not, therefore, fall under the first class of contracts which create the

³ AIR 2000 SC 3026

⁴ (2001) 4 SCC 661

⁵ 1988 (sup) SCC 580

disqualification. The question for determination is whether the contract to collect toll at a Government ferry entered into in accordance with the Ferries Act amounts to a contract for the execution of any works undertaken by the Government. At this stage we should remember that the words ‘or the performance of any services’ were omitted from Section 7(d) by the amendment made in the year 1958. In *N. Satyanathan v. K. Subramanyan and Ors.* : [1955] 2SCR83 this Court had occasion to construe Section 7(d) of the Act before its amendment in 1958. In that case the appellant was a contractor who had entered into an agreement with the Central Government whereby he had contracted with the Governor-General for the provision of a Motor Vehicle Service for the conveyance of postal articles and mail bags. Under the contract the Governor-General had agreed to pay to the contractor Rs.200/- per month during the subsistence of the agreement as his remuneration for service to be rendered by him. The appellant therein was held to be disqualified under Section 7(d) of the Act, as it stood then, as he had undertaken to carry out a service which the Government had undertaken to do. The Court said that “it cannot be gainsaid that the Government in the Postal Department is rendering a very useful service and that the appellant has by his contract with the Government undertaken to render that kind of service on a specified route. The present case is a straightforward illustration of the kind of contract contemplated by Section 7(d) of the Act.” The Court took the above view in view of the presence of words ‘the performance of any service’ under Section 7(d) of the Act, as it stood then. Those words were omitted from Section 7(d) on its amendment in the year 1958 and Section 9-A of the Act as it stands today also does not contain those words. In *Ram Padarath Mahto v. Mishri Singh and Anr.* : [1961]2SCR470 a similar question arose for consideration. The appellant in that appeal was a member of a joint Hindu family which carried on the business of Government stockists of grain under a contract with the Government of Bihar. His nomination for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly was rejected on the ground that he was disqualified under Section 7(d) of the Act, as he had an interest in a contract for the performance of service undertaken by the Bihar Government. The appellant contended that the service undertaken by the Government was the sale of food grains under the Grain Supply Scheme and the contract was not for the sale of such food grains and did not attract the provisions of Section 7(d) of the Act. This Court held that the contract was not one for the purpose of any service undertaken by the Government and the appellant therein was not disqualified under Section 7(d) of the Act. The Court held that a contract of bailment which imposed on the bailee the obligation to stock and store the food-grains in his godowns was not a contract for the purpose of the service of sale of grain which the Government had undertaken. The Government had undertaken the work of supplying grain but the contract was not one for the supply of grain. The Court distinguished the decision in *N. Satyanathan v. K. Subramanyam* (supra) while reaching the conclusion that the appellant was not disqualified for being chosen as a member of the Bihar Legislature. So even at a time prior to the amendment of Section 7(d) of the Act in the year 1958 it was possible to take the view that certain types of contracts entered into with the appropriate Government, even though they were subsisting on the date of scrutiny of nomination did not disqualify a person from being chosen as a member of the State Legislature. It is pertinent to refer to the observation made by Gajendragadkar, J. in *Ram Padarath Mahto’s* case (supra) which runs as under:

It may sound technical, but in dealing with a statutory provision which imposes a disqualification on a citizen it would be unreasonable to take merely a broad and general view and ignore the essential points of distinction on the ground that they are technical. The narrow question is: if the State Government undertook the work of supplying the grain, is the contract one for the supply of grain?; in our opinion, the answer to this question must be in the negative; that is why we think the High Court did not correctly appreciate the effect of the contract when it held that the said contract brought the appellant’s case within the mischief of Section 7(d).

17. Unless the contract in question is one which clearly falls under Section 9-A of the Act, it would not be proper to hold that the person who is a party to the contract is disqualified for being chosen as a member to the State Legislature. In *Lakshmikantha Rao v. D. Chinna Mallaiah and Ors.* : AIR 1979AP132 the question that arose for consideration was whether a person who was carrying on the business in arrack and toddy under the contract with the Government under the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Excise Act, 1968 was disqualified for being chosen as a member of the Legislature. The facts of that case briefly stated were thus. There was an agreement between the highest bidder, i.e., the returned candidate and the Government in respect of the carrying on the business in arrack and toddy. A perusal of the relevant provisions, i.e., Sections 15 and 17 of the Andhra Pradesh Excise Act and Rule 21 of the Rules framed under that Act as well as the agreements signed framed under that Act as well as the agreements signed by the returned candidate, showed that the highest bidder had to deposit the monthly rentals and purchase the arrack from the Government at the issue price and sell the same to the public. If there were any arrears in the monthly rentals the same could be recovered as arrears of land revenue. Similarly with regard to the toddy shop he had to tap the toddy from the trees allotted to him by the Government by paying the tree-tax and sell the toddy to the public. For the toddy shop also he had to pay monthly rentals and if he fell in arrears the same could be recovered as arrears of land revenue. There were other incidental conditions in the agreements. The Andhra Pradesh High Court held that since the contracts entered into by the successful candidate with the State Government to sell arrack and toddy did not come within the State Government to sell arrack and toddy did not come within the mischief of Section 9-A of the Act as they were neither for supply of goods to the Government nor for the execution of any works

undertaken he did not suffer from any disqualification for being chosen as a member of the Legislative Assembly. We have gone through the above decision carefully. We are of the view that the High was right in the said case in holding that the returned candidate had not suffered from any disqualification by reason of the fact that he was an excise contractor.

18. In the present case the position of the 1st respondent is more or less similar to the position of the returned candidate in the decision of the Andhra Pradesh High Court. The 1st respondent had acquired in the public auction the right to collect the toll by paying the amount which he had offered to pay under the contract. He had not undertaken thereby any contract for execution of any works undertaken by the Government. The word 'works' in the expression in 'execution of any works' appearing in Section 9-A of the Act is used in the sense of 'projects', 'schemes', 'plants', such as building works irrigation works defence works etc. The 1st respondent in this case had not undertaken to carry on any such work. According to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary the expression 'work' means a structure or apparatus of some kind; an architectural or engineering structure, a building edifice. When it is used in plural, i.e., as 'works' it means 'architectural or engineering operations; a fortified building; a defensive structure, fortification; any of the several parts of such structure.' The word 'works' used in Entry 35 of List II of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution of India which reads as "works, lands and buildings vested in or in the possession of the State" is used in the same sense. The running of boats across inland waterways is a topic which falls under Entry 32 of List III of the Seventh Schedule which reads thus: "Shipping and navigation on inland waterways as regards mechanically propelled vessels, and the rule of the road on such waterways, and the carriage of passengers and goods on inland waterways subject to the provisions of List I with respect to national waterways." It is, therefore, difficult to hold that when a person acquires the right to collect toll at a public ferry under Section 8 of the Ferries Act he is performing a contract of execution of works undertaken by the Government. It may have been perhaps different if the words 'in performance of any services' which were present in Section 7(d) of the Act, as it stood prior to its amendment in 1958 had been there in Section 9-A of the Act.

19. We do not find any substance in the argument urged on behalf of the appellant that because under Condition No. 10 of the form of lease prescribed under the Ferries Act the lessee is under an obligation during the period of lease to mark buoys or in any other suitable manner, all submerged obstruction or dangerous rocks in the rivers within half a mile of the landing ghats and shall be held responsible for any loss of damage caused to the mar boats striking against such submerged obstructions or dangerous rocks it should be held that the 1st respondent had undertaken to execute works undertaken by the Government. The above condition only requires the lessee to mark buoys or in any other suitable manner the places where there were any submerged obstruction or dangerous rocks within half a mile of the landing ghats. Having regard to the conditions of the lease and the provisions of the Act and the Rules made thereunder we are clearly of the view that the activity undertaken by the lessee under the agreement cannot be considered as an agreement for execution of works undertaken by the State Government.

20. We are, therefore, of the view that the contract which the 1st respondent had entered into with the State Government even though it was subsisting on the date of scrutiny of nominations would not have the effect of disqualifying him for being chosen as a member of the State Legislative Assembly since Section 9-A of the Act is not at all attracted to such a case."

29. In **C.V.K. Rao V. DANTU BHASKARA RAO**⁶ the Hon'ble Supreme Court at paragraph-3 held as under:

"3. The disqualification which results from s.7(d) is conditioned by a number of circumstances. First, there must be a subsisting contract (this is to say in actual existence) between the appropriate Government and the candidate. Then the contract must be in the course of the trade or business of the candidate and, finally, it must be inter alia for the supply of goods to such Government. The appropriate Government according to the definition of the expression is the Government of Andhra Pradesh....."

30. In **LAKSHMIKANTHA RAO V. CHINNA MALLAIAH**⁷ this Court at paragraphs-12, 17 & 18 held as under:

"12. There is no doubt that the object of the Parliament in enacting Section 9-A was to preserve the integrity and independence of the members of the Legislature and to keep the Legislature beyond any suspicion in the interests of public morality. But as observed by the Supreme Court in *Konappa v. Vishwanth.*, : [1969] 2SCR 90 the right of a person to stand for an election is valuable right just as a right of a person to vote and that a sensible view of the section will have to be taken. In *Bhaskara Rao v. C. V. K. Rao*, : AIR1964AP77 a Division Bench of this court while considering the scope of the old Section 7(d) which is analogous to the present Section 9-A, observed thus (at P. 82):

⁶ AIR 1965 SC 93

⁷ 1978 (II) Andhra Law Times Reports-460

“Since Section 7(d) is disabling provision and deprives citizens of India of the right to stand for election and serve the community, it should receive a very strict interpretation. Statutes which encroach on the rights of the subject, whether as regards person or property, are subject to a strict construction and it is a recognised rule that they should be interpreted if possible, so as to respect such rights and if there is any ambiguity as to the meaning of the sections, inasmuch as it is a disabling section, the construction which is in favour of the freedom of the individual should be given effect to as stated by Maxwell.”

The learned Judges The learned Judge also considered the other contention viz., that the object of the Parliament in enacting the disabling section is to maintain the integrity of the members of the Legislature and that any interpretation contrary to such an intendment cannot be made, and held thus (at P. 83):-

No exception could be taken to these rules as stated thus. But at the same time, we cannot overlook the cardinal rule that Courts should not strain the language of a statute in order to cover cases which are plainly excluded from the natural meaning of the words.

In this context it is beneficial to refer to some passages from ‘Maxwell on Interpretation of Statutes’, which read thus:-

The first and most elementary rule of construction is that it is to be assumed that the words and phrases of technical legislation are used in their technical meaning if they have acquired one, and otherwise in their ordinary meaning, and the second is that the phrases and sentences are to be construed according to the rules of grammar. The safer and more correct course of dealing with a question of construction is to take the words themselves and arrive if possible at their meaning without. In the first instance reference to cases.

The rule of construction is ‘to intend Legislature to have meant what they have actually expressed.’ The object of all interpretation is to discover the intention of Parliament, ‘but the intention of Parliament must be deduced from the language used, ‘for it’ it is well accepted that the belief and assumptions of those who frame Acts of Parliament cannot make the law.’

Bearing these principles in mind, if we examine the plain language of Section 9-A we notice that the two important requirements, apart from other requirements, under the section are, the subsisting contract must be for the supply of goods to the Government, or for the execution of any works undertaken by the Government. The nature of the contract in the instant case prima facie is such that the 1st respondent was not under an obligation to supply any goods to the Government or the contract is for the execution of any works undertaken by the Government.

17. It can. Therefore, be seen that the contract entered into by the 1st respondent in the present case with the Govt. to sell arrack and toddy to the public after due payments of rentals to the Government does not amount to contract for the execution of any works undertaken” by the Government. The relevant Provisions of the A.P. Excise Act and the Rules referred to above only indicate that the Government has the monopoly to buy, sell or to import any intoxicant: and under Section 17 it can grant a lease in favour of any person for fixed period subject to certain conditions for the supply, manufacture or sale of intoxicants. In the instant case the lease granted in favour of the 1st respondent who was the highest bidder, was only for the sale toddy and arrack in those two villages for one year. The scheme of the Excise Act of the Rules made thereunder do not in any way indicate that the Government has undertaken any works” within the meaning Section 9-A or the Representation of the People Act, and I see no reason to take a different view from the one taken by the Madhya Pradesh High Court in Satya Prakash’s case: AIR1963MP316, which has been followed by the Patna and the Allahabad High Courts as mentioned supra.

18. It may be that if Section 9-A had been in the Same terms as that of Section 7(d) as it stood prior to the amendment the contracts of this nature under the A.P. Excise Act would have come within the sweep of the words “the performance of any services”. But those words are omitted by the amendment Act of 1958. It is already noticed that Same innocuous Contracts like carrying Postal mail bags, etc. came within the mischief of Sec. of 7(d) as it stood prior to the Amendment and the candidates holding such contracts were disqualified. But Section 9-A which is in pari material with Section 7(d) after amendment does not cover all kinds of contract which are in a way meant for ‘the performance of any services undertaken by the Government. It may not be possible to say that the persons who have excise contracts with the Government are of lesser consequence from the point of view of the integrity and independence of the Legislators when compared to the other persons who have some contracts either for supply of goods to the Government or for the execution of any works undertaken by the Government. The accusing finger in this context can as well be pointed against the persons doing Excise contracts. But after the omission of the words “the performance of any services” in the relevant provision of law it can no more be said that all contracts for the performance of any services undertaken by the Government still come within the mischief of Section 9-A The language of “Section 9-A is clear and this Court cannot construe the section in a different manner by straining the same. The remedy to set right incongruity, if any, lies with the Legislature.”

31. In **RANJEET SINGH V. HARMOHINDER SINGH PRADHAN**⁸ the Hon'ble Supreme Court at paragraphs 3 & 7 held as under:

“3. On its plain reading, Section 9A of the Act requires (i) that there must be a subsisting contract which has been entered into by the person whose candidature is sought to be disqualified with the government; (ii) that contract is for the supply of goods to the Government, or (iii) that the contract is for the execution of any works undertaken by the Government.

7. Section 9A is a statutory provision which imposes a disqualification on a citizen. It would, therefore, be unreasonable to take a general or broad view, ignoring the essentials of the Section and the intention of the Legislature. Purposive interpretation is necessary. In *DewanJoynal's case* (supra), Section 9A of the Act has been correctly interpreted in the following words:

An analysis of Section 9A of the Act shows that only in two cases a person would be disqualified if he has entered into a contract with the appropriate Government in the course of his trade or business which is subsisting on the date of scrutiny of nomination. They are (i) when the contract is one for supply of goods to the appropriate Government and (ii) where the contract is for the execution of any works undertaken by the Government....

...the Andhra Pradesh High Court held that since the contracts entered into by the successful candidate with the State Government to sell a rack and toddy did not come within the mischief of Section 9A of the Act as they were neither for supply of goods to the Government nor for the execution of any works undertaken he did not suffer from any disqualification for being chosen as a member of the Legislative Assembly. We have gone through the above decision carefully. We are of the view that the High Court was right in the said case in holding that the returned candidate had not suffered from any disqualification by reason of the fact that he was an excise contractor.”

32. In **UMESH CHALLIYILL V. K.P. RAJENDRAN**⁹ the Hon'ble Supreme Court at paragraphs-6, 12, 19, & 20 held as under:

“6. Section 83 of the Act of 1951 states what are the contents of the election petition. Section 83 reads as under:

83. Contents of petition.- (1) An election petition-

(a) shall contain a concise statement of the material facts on which the petitioner relies;

(b) shall set forth full particulars of any corrupt practice that the petitioner alleges including as full a statement as possible of the names of the parties alleged to have committed such corrupt practice and the date and place of the commission of each such practice; and

(c) shall be signed by the petitioner and verified in the manner laid down in the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (5 of 1908) for the verification of pleadings: Provided that where the petitioner alleges any corrupt practice, the petition shall also be accompanied by an affidavit in the prescribed form in support of the allegation of such corrupt practice and the particulars thereof.

(2) Any schedule or annexure to the petition shall also be signed by the petitioner and verified in the same manner as the petition.

As per section 83, a concise statement of material facts should be given in the petition and if the allegations are of corrupt practice then the a full statement, as far as possible, all names of the parties alleged to have committed such corrupt practice and the date and place of the commission of each such practice has to be disclosed and it shall be signed by the petitioner and verified in the manner laid down in the CPC for verification of the pleadings. It further provided that where the allegations are of corrupt practice, the petition shall also be accompanied by an affidavit in the prescribed form in support of the allegation of such corrupt practice and the particulars thereof in Form No. 25.

12. Both the defects which have been pointed out by learned Single Judge were too innocuous to have resulted in dismissal of the election petition on the basis of the preliminary objection. The Courts have to view it whether the objections go to the root of the matter or they are only cosmetic in nature. It is true that the election petition has to be seriously construed. But that apart the election petition should not be summarily dismissed on such small breach of procedure. Section 83 itself says that the election petition should contain material facts. Section 86 says that the High Court shall dismiss the election petition which does not comply with the provisions of Section 81 of Section 82 or Section 117. But not of defect of the nature as pointed out by the respondent would entail dismissal of the election petition. These were the defects, even if the Court has construed them to be of serious nature, at least notice should have been issued to the party to rectify the same instead of resorting to dismissal of the election petition at the outset.

19. In **R.P. Moidutt v. P.T. Kunju Mohammad and Anr.**—AIR 2000SC3388 their Lordships have expressed that heavy onus lies on the election petitioner seeking setting aside of the election of a successful candidate to make out a clear case for such relief both in the pleadings and at the trial. The mandate of the

⁸ (1999) 4 SCC 517

⁹ (2008) 11 SCC 740

people should not be interfered lightly and it emphasized that under Section 83 of the Act ordinarily it would suffice if the election petition contains concise statement of the material facts relied on the petitioner but in the case of corrupt practice the election petition must set forth full particulars thereof including as full a statements as possible of the names of the parties alleged to have committed such corrupt practice, the date and place of the commission of each such practice. An election petition is required to be signed and verified in the same manner as is laid down in the Code of Civil procedure, 1908 for the verification of pleadings. But this case has nothing to do with regard to the defective pleadings. This case only emphasized that the election petition should not be lightly dealt with. In this case also objection of improper verification was pressed into service but neither the verification in the election petition nor the affidavit was cured and on the contrary the same was pressed into service and pursued by the election petitioner by arguing the matter before the Court. The election petitioner persistently pursued the election petition without rectification, therefore, this Court dismissed the petition on that ground. It was therefore, observed as follows:

“The object of requiring verification of an election petition is to clearly fix responsibility for the averments and allegations in the petition on the person signing the verification and, at the same time, discouraging wild and irresponsible allegations unsupported by facts. However, the defect of verification is not fatal to the petition, it can be cured. In the present case the petitioner persisted in pursuing the petition without proper verification which the petitioner should not have been permitted to do. Unless the defect in verification was rectified, the petition could not have been tried. For want of affidavit in the required form and also for lack of particulars, the allegations of corrupt practice could not have been enquired into and tried at all. In fact, the present one is a fit case where the petition should have been rejected at the threshold for non-compliance with the mandatory provisions of law as to pleadings. The affidavit filed by the petitioner in support of the election petition as required by Rule 94-A also does not satisfy the requirement of the proviso to Sub-section (1) of Section 83 of the Act and Form 25 appended to the rules.”

In this case, the election petition was dismissed not on the threshold but after going through the whole trial. It was observed at paragraph 35 of the judgment as follows:

“35. All the averments made in paras 1 to 17 of the petition have been stated to be true to the personal knowledge of the petitioner and in the next breath the very same averments have been stated to be based on the information of the petitioner and believed by him to be true. The source of information is not disclosed. As observed by the Supreme Court in *F.A. Sapa v. Singora* the object of requiring verification of an election petition is to clearly fix the responsibility for the averments and allegations in the petition on the person signing the verification and, at the same time, discouraging wild and irresponsible allegations unsupported by facts. However, the defect of verification is not fatal to the petition, it can be cured (see *Muraka Radhey Shyam Ram Kumar v. Roop Singh Rathore* and *A.S. Subbaraj v. M. Muthiah*). In the present case the defect in verification was pointed out by raising a plea in that regard in the written statement. The objection was pressed and pursued by arguing the same before the court. However, the petitioner persisted in pursuing the petition without proper verification which the petitioner should not have been permitted to do. In our opinion, unless the defect in verification was rectified, the petition could not have been tried. For want of affidavit in the required form and also for lack of particulars, the allegations of corrupt practice could not have been enquired into and tried at all. In fact, the present one is a fit case where the petition should have been rejected at the threshold for non-compliance with the mandatory provisions of law as to pleading.”

Therefore, this case is entirely different where trial was gone into and it was clearly found that the verification was not in proper form. Therefore, that evidence cannot be taken into consideration. The petitioner even did not rectify the defect. The Court found that the averments could not be looked into. Therefore, this case is distinguishable on the facts and as successive judgments which have been quoted above have consistently taken the view that such defects cannot be taken as a ground for dismissing the election petition and such defects are curable.

20. 15. However, in fairness whenever such defects are pointed then the proper course for the Court is not to dismiss the petition at the threshold. In order to maintain the sanctity of the election the Court should not take such a technical attitude and dismiss the election petition at the threshold. On the contrary after finding the defects, the Court should give proper opportunity to cure the defects and in case of failure to remove/cure the defects, it could result into dismissal on account of Order 6 Rule 17 or Order 7 Rule 11 CPC. Though technically it cannot be dismissed under Section 86 of the Act of 1951 but it can be rejected when the election petition is not properly constituted as required under the provisions of the CPC but in the present case we regret to record that the defects which have been pointed out in this election petition was purely cosmetic and it does not go to the root of the matter and secondly even if the Court found them of serious nature then at least the court should have given an opportunity to the petitioner to rectify such defects.”

33. Having given a thoughtful consideration to the erudite submissions of the learned Counsel and the authorities referred to above, I am of the opinion that at this stage it may not be proper to go into the question as to whether the business which the successful candidate was doing as a distributor of the liquefied petroleum gas can be said

to fall within the mischief of Section 9-A of Act so as hold that he is disqualified from contesting the election or for that matter that do not disentitle the petitioner/1st respondent to contest the elections. This is a matter which has to be adjudicated after a detailed inquiry in the Election Petition but it may not be proper to reject the Election Petition at the threshold on the ground that it does not disclose cause of action. As already observed, the specific allegation of the Election Petitioner is that the successful candidate suffers the disqualification in view of his admitted business of being a distributor in the liquefied petroleum gas under an agreement with the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, which is admittedly a Government owned oil company. Whether such a trade or business amounts to having a contract with the State or Central Government is a matter to be adjudicated after full-fledged trial or inquiry in the Election Petition. At the stage of considering an application under Order VII Rule 11 C.P.C., and as held by the Apex Court, what is all that is required to be seen is as to whether a reading of the Election Petition in to shows the existence of a cause of action for an Election Petitioner to challenge the election of a successful candidate or not. The facts which are essential to disclose the complete cause of action are required to be pleaded and a perusal of the Election Petition particularly paras 6 and 7 clearly show the existence of a cause of action, which read as under:

“6. I submit that the respondent No.1 submitted Form-26 to the Returning Officer-cum-District Collector while submitting his nomination where under while giving the details of movable assets against the column “personal loans/advance given to any person or entity including firm, company, trust etc., and other receivables from”, the respondent No.1 categorically stated that “Advance with BPCL Rs. 1,49,393/- and there by the respondent No. 1 admitted his investment in the contract entered into by M/s. Roni Bharath Gas with the Central Government being the appropriate **Government** in the course of his business and therefore the respondent No. 1 suffered the disqualification under section 9-A of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 consequently the election of the respondent No. 1 to the 15-Warangal (SC) Parliamentary Constituency is liable to be declared as void and consequently the petitioner shall be declared as duly elected.

7. I submit that the respondent No. 1 made a false statement in the Form-26 where under at the column “details of profession or occupation” the respondent No. 1 categorically stated that the profession or occupation of his spouse as “House Wife” which is a false statement inasmuch as the spouse of the respondent No. 1 is an authorized signatory to the contract entered into between the Bharath Petroleum Corporation Limited and M/s. Foni Bharath Gas which is proprietary concern owned by the respondent No. 1”

34. The truthfulness, the validity or the correctness thereof cannot be decided at the threshold. In my opinion, it may be just and proper to adjudicate on this issue without affording an opportunity to either of the parties to substantiate or rebut the allegations as contained in the Election Petition.

35. The scope of the enquiry in the present application is limited to the extent to see as to whether the plain reading of the averments contained in the Election Petition in its entirety disclose the cause of action so as to proceed with the trial in the Election Petition. In the instant case, the averments in the Election Petition do disclose the cause of action and the issues raised are triable.

36. The other objection of the petitioner/1st respondent is that the election petition has not been properly filed in as much as there is no compliance of Section 83 (1) (c) of the Act which mandates that every petition shall be signed by the petitioner and the same is to be filed in the manner as laid down in the Civil Procedure Code for the verification of pleadings and it is mandatory that the 1st respondent/petitioner shall affirm and sign in the presence of notary. On the other hand, in the election petition filed by the 1st respondent/petitioner it is only stated that the petition is affirmed and it is not stated that the 1st respondent/petitioner affirmed in the presence of notary, and omission to state that the petition is signed in the presence of notary is an omission of vital nature and does not amount substantial compliance of the provisions of the Representation of People Act.

37. There is no dispute insofar as the legal position is concerned. However, it is settled proposition that the defects which are pointed out are curable defects and on that score the election is not liable to be rejected under the provision of Order VII Rule-11 C.P.C. As a matter of fact, the 1st respondent/election petitioner has already filed applications in order to cure the defects pointed out by the petitioner herein. Therefore, there is no substance in the objection of the petitioner herein.

38. The cumulative effect of the above discussion is that there are no merits in the present application and the same is liable to be dismissed. Needless to say that any observations made herein are made only for adjudicating the application in hand without touching into the merits of the main Election Petition. It is also made clear that the question as to whether the petitioner herein suffered disqualification in view of the existing trade or business with Bharath Petroleum Corporation Limited, which disentitles him to contest the election or otherwise, is left open to be adjudicated in the main election petition.

39. In view of the foregoing reasons, this Application is dismissed.

Sd/- S.V. RAMANA MURTHY

Jt. REGISTRAR

HIGH COURT

Dt: 19.09.2016

ORDER

ELECTION APPLICATION NO. 623 OF 2016

IN

ELECTION PETITION NO.1 OF 2016

DISMISSING THE ELECTION APPLICATION.

[No. 82/ECI/TERR/TEL-HP(1/2016)/2017]

By Order,

S. K. RUDOLA, Principal Secy.